



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/296,757	04/23/1999	ADAM J. SIMONOFF	79259	8841

7590 01/16/2003

MATTHEW J. BUSSAN
OFFICE OF COUNSEL NAVAL SURFACE
WARFARE CENTER DAHLGREN DIVISION
17320 DAHLGREN ROAD
DAHLGREN, VA 24485

EXAMINER

VU, VIET DUY

12

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 12

Application Number: 09/296,757
Filing Date: April 23, 2000
Appellant(s): SIMONOFF, ADAM J.

Matthew J. Bussan
For Appellant

MAILED

JAN 16 2003

Technology Center 2100

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed September 23, 2002.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claim*

The appellant agreed that claims 1-21 stand or fall together.

(8) *Claims Appealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by England, U.S. pat. No. 6,144,991.

England discloses a method and system for facilitating collaboration between a plurality of users comprising:

- a) selectively generating texts, freehand drawing objects, and hyperlinks at a user location using a web browser, which are displayable on a whiteboard area (see col 13, lines 40-50; col 30, lines 35-67; and col 33, lines 19-32),
- b) transmitting to and accumulating all generated objects at collaboration server (piper server 502) (see col 26, lines 20-29),
- c) selectively forwarding (i.e., filtering) the received objects to session specific users, each user having an associated privilege level, i.e., active participant, non-participant, etc., (see col 11, lines 21-33; col 28, lines 57-60; and col 29, lines 24-58).

Per claims 9 and 17, England also teaches remove a user from a session in response to a command (see col 28, lines 38-55).

Per claims 11-12 and 19-20, England teaches recording a session for later view by a user (see col 22, lines 35-64).

(11) Response to Argument

The appellant alleges that England does not teach using the whiteboard to generate an active hyperlink object.

First, the examiner is unable to find the alleged limitation in the present claims. For instance, claim 1 cites the step of generating text objects, handdrawn objects and active hyperlinks that are displayable on the whiteboard. Claim 1 does not require using the whiteboard to generate those objects. In England, a user uses the web browser to generate similar objects to share and exchange notes, diagrams and active hyperlinks (URLs) that are displayable on the whiteboard (see col 13, lines 40-50). It is noted that an embedded URL ("click here") in a web page is an active hyperlink. Thus, it is submitted that England's teachings meet the claim limitation.

The appellant alleges that England teaches transmitting only commands not data from one user to another users.

The examiner disagrees. Evidently in order for users to exchange notes, some form of data (i.e., the note itself) must be transmitted from one user to others via the server (see col 13, lines 40-50). Since the current claims do not require the transmitted objects to be of any specific format, it is irrelevant as to whether specific types of data or object formats are used in England for enabling the collaboration.

The appellant also alleges that England does not teach transmitting and accumulating the generated objects.

The examiner disagrees. England teaches using a piper server (502) for receiving/accumulating all data and commands from any users and distributing the

received/accumulated data and commands to other users in the same session (see col 26, lines 20-27).

The appellant also alleges that England fails to teach filtering data objects, i.e., sending select objects to select users.

The examiner disagrees. The fact that England's collaboration server supports multiple simultaneous independent sessions requires such data filtering capability because a select data or command must be forwarded to only participants in a particular session, not to all connected users in all sessions (see col 11, lines 21-33). It should be noted that since there is no requirement in the claims that users in different sessions must collaborate each other, England's teaching is deemed sufficient meeting the claim limitations.

Per claims 5 and 13, the appellant alleges that England does not teach generating active track objects.

The examiner disagrees. England drawing tool illustrates the use click-and-drag actions with the mouse to generate freehand drawing objects and/or predefined shape objects, e.g., lines, (see col 33, lines 19-28).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Viet Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2154




VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 10, 2003

Conferees
Saleh Najjar
Zarni Maung



ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER



SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER

JAMES B. BECHTEL
NSWCDD (CD222)
DAHLGREN, VA 22448-5100